

mess and are our minimum expectations for the President of the United States. President Biden must do better.

STOPPING HUNGER IN AMERICA

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, our children are hungry, and I rise to support hungry children and to end their hunger.

I rise to support the Keep Kids Fed Act of 2022. One in every seven households with children struggle to get enough food on the table.

Just weeks into our pandemic, which still continues, one in every three households with children, nearly half of all mothers, struggle to feed our children.

It is crucial that we take emergency action to immediately stop the hunger in this Nation, and certainly, we should look around the world, as well.

Congress must extend key flexibilities, and so this legislation provides nationwide waiver authority, allows waivers related to the summer food program.

In my district, all of the school districts have children that are in need of food: breakfast, lunch, and dinner. Stop hungry children from suffering and pass this legislation and end hunger for children as we know it.

The work must continue. Hungry children cannot be what America is defined as, and they must be safe. I ask my colleagues to join me in stopping hunger in America in our children and families.

□ 0915

HONORING THE CAREER OF LAURA MULLIGAN THOMAS

(Mr. GOOD of Virginia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Laura Mulligan Thomas.

On May 18, 2022, Laura Mulligan Thomas, alongside her students, presented her final concert as director of the Charlottesville High School orchestra.

After a 40-year career at Charlottesville High School, Ms. Thomas will begin her retirement on June 30, 2022. She began in 1982 with a group of just eight CHS students as part of the CHS orchestra. Now that orchestra includes over 100 students and is internationally recognized.

Ms. Thomas has received a number of awards, including winning the 2022 American String Teachers Association's Elizabeth A. H. Green School Educator Award. Beyond the accolades she has received, I specifically want to thank her for her commitment to supporting the students of Charlottesville High School.

Perhaps the greatest testament to Ms. Thomas' work is knowing that

many of her students have gone on to become music teachers just like her.

I thank Laura Mulligan Thomas for her dedication to Charlottesville High School and her community. I wish her the best in her retirement.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, June 23, 2022.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on June 23, 2022, at 11:30 p.m.

That the Senate passed S. 4261.

That the Senate agrees to the House of Representatives amendment with further amendments S. 2938.

That the Senate agrees to the House of Representatives amendments with a further amendment S. 2089.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KEVIN F. MCCUMBER,
Deputy Clerk.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO S. 2938, JOSEPH WOODROW HATCHETT UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE AND FEDERAL BUILDING; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO S. 2089, KEEP KIDS FED ACT OF 2022; RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4346, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2022; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MCGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 117-385) on the resolution (H. Res. 1204) providing for consideration of the Senate amendments to the House amendment to the bill (S. 2938) to designate the United States Courthouse and Federal Building located at 111 North Adams Street in Tallahassee, Florida, as the "Joseph Woodrow Hatchett United States Courthouse and Federal Building", and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the bill (S. 2089) to amend the Families First Coronavirus Response Act to extend child nutrition waiver authority, and for other purposes; relating to consideration of the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 4346) making appropriations for Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes; and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENTS TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO S. 2938, JOSEPH WOODROW HATCHETT UNITED STATES COURTHOUSE AND FEDERAL BUILDING; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO S. 2089, KEEP KIDS FED ACT OF 2022; RELATING TO CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 4346, LEGISLATIVE BRANCH APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2022; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1204 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1204

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2938) to designate the United States Courthouse and Federal Building located at 111 North Adams Street in Tallahassee, Florida, as the "Joseph Woodrow Hatchett United States Courthouse and Federal Building", and for other purposes, with the Senate amendments to the House amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a single motion offered by the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendments to the House amendment. The Senate amendments and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 2089) to amend the Families First Coronavirus Response Act to extend child nutrition waiver authority, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment to the House amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Education and Labor or his designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment to the House amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and Labor or their respective designees. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to its adoption without intervening motion.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall be considered to have taken from the Speaker's table the bill (H.R. 4346) making appropriations for Legislative Branch for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes, with the Senate amendment thereto, and to have concurred in the Senate amendment with an amendment consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 117-53.

SEC. 4. House Resolution 1132 is hereby adopted.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the

customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, earlier today, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 1204, for two measures.

First, it provides for consideration of the Senate amendments to the House amendment to S. 2938, the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act. The rule makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on the Judiciary that the House concur in the Senate amendments. It provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

Second, the rule provides for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to S. 2089, the Keep Kids Fed Act of 2022. The rule makes in order a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on Education and Labor that the House concur in the Senate amendment and provides 10 minutes of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Education and Labor.

Finally, the rule deems passage of H. Res. 1132 and deems that the House concur in the Senate amendment to H.R. 4346 with an amendment.

Madam Speaker, let me first say that I am so disappointed with where this school meals extension landed. We had a bipartisan, bicameral agreement in place, a measure that, in my opinion, didn't go far enough. But I was willing to support it because we have a hunger cliff looming in 6 days.

It passed the House yesterday by a vote of 376-42. Then, one Senator decided to hold up the bill, a bill to give kids free meals over the summer and provide administrative flexibilities and extra funding to schools in the fall. The objection? A provision that gave free meals at school for kids at 185 percent of poverty or below. For a family of four, that is a family with a maximum total household income of just over \$50,000 a year.

What a rotten thing to do. I can't say the words I would like to use on the House floor to describe just how callous this is, so let me just say this: It takes a real jerk to take food out of the mouths of kids.

I am going to support this bill. The stakes are too high for us not to support it, and there are a lot of good provisions in here, provisions that extend

the flexibilities and provide a reimbursement rate increase to schools to help them continue serving kids nutritious meals and extend universal free meals over the summer.

But I am going to continue fighting like hell at every chance to make sure that every child gets a free breakfast and lunch as part of their school day.

Food is a right. I believe it is a fundamental human right. And for kids living in poverty, school meals are sometimes the only nutritious food that they have access to.

I thank my friends, Chairman SCOTT and Chairwoman STABENOW, for their work in averting the hunger cliff and getting free meals to kids this summer. I thank Speaker PELOSI for her incredible leadership. I thank Chairwoman ROSA DELAURO for her persistence on this.

They are all dedicated to ending hunger, especially among children. I am going to continue to work with them until we finally end hunger in this country once and for all.

In addition, Madam Speaker, let me just say that this is a historic moment. We are on the threshold of passing the first major overhaul of Federal gun safety legislation in decades. This bill that we will soon vote on will save lives, and it couldn't come at a more important time.

As the American people are demanding that we do more to prevent gun violence, the Supreme Court is recklessly striking down gun safety laws that have been on the books for over a century.

As the American people look to Congress to take action to prevent the next mass shooting, House Republican leaders are caving to the gun lobby, whipping against a bipartisan, bicameral agreement of commonsense gun safety measures that an overwhelming majority of the American people support.

Despite what you will hear on the floor today, the American people get it. They know the terrible toll gun violence has taken on communities all across this country: over 100 per day killed by guns; more children killed with a gun in the last two decades than on-duty police officers and Active-Duty military combined; the list of mass shootings and tragedies grows longer and longer by the month.

Yet, if you talk to Republicans here in the House, you would think we are living in an alternative universe. Just this week, most Republicans voted down a bill to alert people when a mass shooting was happening near them. Let me repeat that: Just this week, Republicans voted down a bill to alert people when a mass shooting was happening near them.

Are you kidding me? What kind of people don't even want you to know which way to run if there is a shooting nearby?

I am so sick and tired of the stranglehold that the gun lobby and their blood money have on the Republican Party.

Enough is enough. The time has come for action. The time has come for us to put aside politics and actually do the right thing.

I commend the many Republicans who have done just that. I don't think I could agree with Senator MITCH MCCONNELL on where to go to have lunch, but he said that the Safer Communities Act is "a commonsense package of popular steps that will help make these horrifying incidents less likely while fully upholding the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens." That is MITCH MCCONNELL.

Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM—and we are polar opposites—said: "The legislation is not perfect, but we must not let the perfect become the enemy of the good." That is LINDSEY GRAHAM.

Even here in the House, some courageous Republicans have said that they will support this bill, like Congressman TONY GONZALES, who said: "It is my duty to pass laws that never infringe on the Constitution while protecting the lives of the innocent."

The U.S. Senate is notorious for not being able to build consensus around solutions to fix the most straightforward of problems, yet here they have come up with a reasonable, bipartisan deal on a contentious issue.

I think it is shameful, quite frankly, that GOP Leader MCCARTHY and his team are parroting the gun lobby's talking points. But what I find even more disappointing, frankly, are the crocodile tears about bipartisanship from the GOP when they vote time and time again against substantial bipartisan deals like this one.

Please spare us the lectures. Nothing in this bill is new. Nothing in this bill is controversial. These ideas have been around for decades, and they are what the American people want.

If people are worried about backlash back home, this is an opportunity for you to correct the record. Go home and tell the truth that this bill does nothing to infringe on the Second Amendment, and it doesn't punish law-abiding gun owners.

□ 0930

This country is crying out for action. Americans are begging us to work together to protect our kids and our communities.

I know I am asking you to vote against your party's leadership. I know that is a tough spot to put some of my Republican friends in. But I think at the end of the day, you owe it to yourself to consider this one idea: What if this bill stops even one mass shooting from happening? Is a "no" vote worth the lives of your constituents?

Don't listen to those who are spreading crazy conspiracy theories, saying that this is going to lead to everyone's guns getting taken away. We hear it over and over and over again. Listen to your GOP colleagues who helped write this bill and who passed it over in the Senate. Listen to the American people who overwhelmingly support this bill, and then listen to your conscience.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the Representative from Massachusetts and the distinguished chair of the Rules Committee for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Madam Speaker, S. 2938, as amended in the Senate, is at its core an effort to chip away at the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens. It has received no hearings, no committee process, and has only recently been released in bill form for the public to review. It came to us very early this morning after the Senate passed it late last night, and my colleagues expect us to vote on this bill later today, despite the egregious procedural violations. Unfortunately for the American people, that is not a unique development here in Congress. I am disappointed that this is the way the majority has chosen to proceed with legislation, with no hearing and no public input.

The bill provides \$750 million over 5 years in Federal Byrne JAG grant funding to States for crisis intervention proceedings, including State-level red flag programs. However, this bill fails to provide explicit due process requirements. We have seen in places where red flag laws have been adopted that these types of laws always infringe on the constitutional rights of law-abiding gun owners. This ambiguous language contains insufficient guardrails to ensure that the money is actually going toward keeping guns out of the hands of criminals or preventing mass violence.

Vague red flag laws are ripe for abuse and can become extremely dangerous. For example, a person could have just gotten out of an abusive relationship and has a firearm to defend themselves against their ex-partner. Their abusive partner could report this individual and have their firearm taken away, putting the victim at even greater risk.

This bill also includes provisions that will lead to enhanced scrutiny of certain adults based on their age before they can exercise their constitutionally guaranteed rights. There are no other constitutional rights in which we require enhanced screenings of certain adults based solely on their age.

There is also surprisingly little in this bill that actually focuses on making our schools safer. The bill does nothing to help provide for additional school resource officers. I suspect this is due to the fact that some of my Democrat colleagues are still incapable of supporting funding for additional law enforcement officers, even in our children's schools.

Lastly, we know that this is just the tip of the iceberg. President Biden and my Democrat colleagues have made it abundantly clear that this is just a "small step" toward their larger gun-grabbing agenda. The actions of this administration's Department of Justice, FBI, and ATF have completely

whittled away the confidence of gun-owning Americans that the provisions in these bills will not be abused beyond their stated scope.

House Republicans are committed to identifying and solving the root causes of violent crimes and bolstering school security, but doing so must not infringe upon the Second Amendment rights of law-abiding citizens. For example, just earlier this week, we voted on the bipartisan Restoring Hope for Mental Health and Well-Being Act. This bill contains the bulk of the mental health care provisions included in the Senate bill, without infringing on Second Amendment rights.

In this case, the bill we are considering under this rule is not only a blatant infringement on lawful gun owners' Second Amendment rights, but an unnecessary duplication of the bipartisan work we have already done.

Madam Speaker, for these reasons, I oppose the rule, ask Members to do the same, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, let me just say that it is a little frustrating to kind of hear my colleagues imply that somehow we are moving too fast, after decades of inaction, of doing absolutely nothing, after massacre after massacre after massacre, doing nothing. Now we are being accused of moving too fast.

Want to talk about the process? We have had countless hearings on gun violence and on measures to combat gun violence in a variety of committees here. We had a committee hold a hearing with a young girl from Uvalde who told Members of Congress that she had to cover herself with the blood of her dead classmate and pretend that she was dead in order to escape being killed herself.

We have heard from law enforcement officials. We have heard from grieving parents. Nothing in this bill is controversial. People have seen—the text of this bill has been available since Tuesday. It is not that complicated.

So when people say: Process, oh, we just need more time, and we should do more hearings, and we should do this and we should do that—no. I mean, this is put up or shut up time for all of us. This is an opportunity that we cannot miss.

So the choice for Members on both sides is simple. I mean, we are either going to do something—again, this is way more modest than anything that I would suggest that we do. But we are either going to do something, or we are going to do the same old same old, nothing.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. SCANLON), a distinguished member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. SCANLON. Madam Speaker, the American people know that we cannot sit idly by and watch preventable gun deaths happen day after day, year after year.

Over the past few weeks, I have heard from hundreds of constituents of all ages and all walks of life who are demanding action to reduce gun violence.

When our Framers gathered in Philadelphia to write the Constitution, they were explicit about the purposes of that entire document: . . . establish justice, to insure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense—not individual Armageddon—"promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

With those words, our Government was created to meet the needs of the people.

But how can we meet the needs of the people if we don't take action to prevent them from being gunned down in their schools, workplaces, houses of worship, or neighborhood streets?

How can we be faithful to the purposes of the Constitution while allowing the routine terrorization and slaughter of our children, neighbors, teachers, doctors, and seniors?

I refuse to tell the American people, and particularly our children, that they must be sacrificial lambs to a twisted theory of armed Second Amendment liberty that defies the express purposes of our Constitution by undermining the general welfare and destroying domestic tranquility.

The American people know, as well as we do, that the time is now to act. The Safer Communities Act is a minimal first step in taking action to keep our children and communities safe. But after 30 years of Senate inaction, it is a step, and we know that it should not be the last.

Our children deserve a brighter future in which they can enjoy the blessings of liberty, instead of being traumatized by active-shooter drills and actual active shooters.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would just like to mention that my distinguished colleague repeatedly talks about how this is not controversial. If it is not controversial, then committee hearings held by the majority should not be a problem. So I would ask again that we follow the procedures of the House.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately consider Congressman HUDSON's STOP II Act, critical legislation that addresses two issues that both sides of the aisle should be able to agree on, hardening for schools and active-shooter training, law enforcement, and mental health funding.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, House Republicans are committed to addressing the tragedy of these school shootings, but we cannot and should not impede the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens. This is not a matter of Democrat or Republican; it is a matter of what is in the Constitution.

Congressman HUDSON's legislation is something we can pass right now, today, that will have immediate positive effects, keeping students safe while getting Americans the mental health resources they need.

Many of these solutions are included in the bill we are considering under the rule, but Congressman HUDSON's solution achieves the same outcome without infringing on our Second Amendment rights.

Madam Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON), to speak further on the amendment.

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, I rise to oppose the previous question so that we can immediately consider my bill, H.R. 7966, the STOP II, Secure Every School and Protect our Nation's Children Act.

It is an honor to be here today. In fact, what an honor that the people of North Carolina's Eighth Congressional District have bestowed upon me to allow me to be their Representative here in the United States Congress.

As I walked the Halls of this Capitol building this morning, I couldn't help but think of the great American patriots who have served here before us.

I think about the patriots who came before, who pledged their lives, their property, and their sacred honor so that we could live in the freedom and prosperity we enjoy today. People like Patrick Henry, who famously said: "Give me liberty or give me death."

The courage of our Founders, the faith, the strength of their convictions, the belief in an ideal—indeed, an idea—that all people are endowed by our creator with certain unalienable rights. And they devised a Constitution that protects and guarantees these rights. It is an incredible thing to think about, the legacy they have left in the hands of this, the 117th Congress. Each one of us swore an oath when we accepted this office. It wasn't an oath to a person or a political party. It was an oath to defend the Constitution.

The issue before us today is what can we do—no, what should we do when faced with the challenge before us, this epidemic of children taking the lives of other children in our schools?

Every single one of us grieves for the lives taken. As the father of an elementary school child, my heart aches for the lives lost and the unimaginable pain and grief felt by those who love them. Neither party cares more about this. Neither political party has a monopoly on wanting to do something.

That is why Republicans have come to the table with ideas that will actually get to some of the root causes of this violence. More than 12 pieces of

legislation have been introduced by Republican Members of this House to strengthen background checks, to improve law enforcement coordination and response, to address the mental health needs of our children, to make schools safer, and to prevent this violence.

To date, my colleagues across the aisle have been unwilling to engage with us, to seek consensus, to work together to solve this problem.

Just a few weeks ago, the majority party brought forth a package of gun control measures. This legislation targeted the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens. This legislation did nothing to address the security in our schools. It did nothing to provide better mental health resources to improve the ability of school officials and law enforcement to intervene with these children in crisis. But it did let a lot of people around here feel better, because they could go home and say: We did something.

Over in the Senate, they aren't even considering this reckless package of bills. But Republicans and Democrats in the Senate did attempt to work together to find a solution, and there are many things that I like about this Senate legislation. In fact, I am flattered that they use much of the mental health and school safety provisions from my legislation. But as much as we feel the need to do something to tackle this problem, we cannot forget that oath that we all took on the first day of this Congress.

□ 0945

Our highest calling as a Member of Congress is to defend the Constitution. And that is where this legislation sent to us by the Senate falls short. This open-ended gun control legislation opens the door to Federal funding of State red flag laws. First of all, these laws don't work.

Madam Speaker, I include in the RECORD a list of 12 mass shootings that have taken place in States that already have red flag laws.

"RED FLAG" FAILURES

May 14, 2022, Buffalo, N.Y.
Payton S. Gedron, 10 fatalities
New York's "Red Flag" law went into effect August 24, 2019
May 26, 2021, San Jose, Calif.
Samuel Cassidy, 9 fatalities
California's "Red Flag" law was enacted in 2016
April 15, 2021, Indianapolis, Ind.
Brandon Scott Hole, 8 fatalities
Indiana's "Red Flag" law went into effect in 2005
March 31, 2021, Orange, Calif.
Aminadab Gaxiola Gonzalez, 4 fatalities
California's "Red Flag" law was enacted in 2016
March 22, 2021, Boulder, Colo.
Ahmad Al Aliwi Alissa, 10 fatalities
Colorado's "Red Flag" law went into effect January 2020
December 10, 2019, Jersey City, N.J.
David N. Anderson and Francine Graham, 4 fatalities
New Jersey's "Red Flag" law went into effect September 1, 2019
July 28, 2019, Gilroy, Calif.

Santino William LeGan, 3 fatalities, 12 injured

California's "Red Flag" law was enacted in 2016

February 15, 2019, Aurora, Ill.
Gary Martin, 5 fatalities
Illinois's "Red Flag" law went into effect January 1, 2019

January 23, 2019, Sebring, Fla.
Zephen A. Xaver, 5 fatalities
Florida's "Red Flag" law took effect March 2018

November 7, 2018, Thousand Oaks, Calif.
Ian David Long, 12 fatalities
California's "Red Flag" law was enacted in 2016

September 12, 2018, Bakersfield, Calif.
Javier Casarez, 5 fatalities
California's "Red Flag" law was enacted in 2016

November 14, 2017, Rancho Tehama, Calif.
Kevin Janson Neal, 5 fatalities
California's "Red Flag" law was enacted in 2016

Mr. HUDSON. Madam Speaker, the State with the most mass shootings is California. California has the most restrictive gun laws in America. California already has a red flag law. But more important to this debate, red flag laws subvert due process protections and threaten the constitutional rights of law-abiding citizens.

Why would we agree to borrow more money that we don't have so the Federal Government can give it to States to enact laws that don't work and that actually threaten the rights of our citizens?

Why would we do that?

Second, this legislation singles out law-abiding citizens under the age of 21 by giving the government discretion to delay, for any reason, their constitutionally protected right to a firearm—a right, by the way, affirmed, yet again, by the Supreme Court just yesterday.

We all want to keep firearms out of the hands of people that shouldn't have them, and I am willing to consider ways to better identify people with mental health challenges, but I can't help but think about that 20-year-old paratrooper stationed in Fort Bragg, North Carolina.

Our Nation entrusted him to defend us with an automatic weapon or a multimillion-dollar-weapon system, but we can't trust him with a semiautomatic weapon to defend themselves in their own home?

What about the 20-year-old spouse back home in Spring Lake, North Carolina, alone because our paratrooper has deployed in service of our Nation. Are we to tell this spouse that the government doesn't trust you to defend your home?

Instead, we are going to delay your purchase for 10 days. At the end of the 10 days, the government doesn't even have to get back to the gun owner or the gun store. Let that gun dealer decide if they want to take a risk on selling you this firearm while an FBI investigation is still open.

No, this is a de facto ban on gun sales to law-abiding citizens under the age of 21.

Third, this legislation also broadens firearm prohibitions for misdemeanors and nonviolent offenders. I think most of us can agree, someone convicted of beating up their spouse ought to be put on the background check system. The law extends this to misdemeanor assault on a spouse or someone with whom you share a child. But we have to be careful when we are talking about taking away a constitutionally protected right over other misdemeanors.

The language of this bill is so broad it can include nonviolent offenders, and I am concerned that the due process protections are simply not there.

So what are we proposing today? Let's set aside these controversial unconstitutional provisions that divide us. Let's unite around the idea that we are going to tackle the real causes of this violence. These school shootings are almost always done by a young male, often from a single-parent or no-parent home. They have experienced some trauma in their life. Most are likely on some behavioral medication, and they have shown plenty of signs of being in crisis. Yet, effective intervention and mental health treatment did not happen.

So let's start there. Today, I rise to propose we defeat this previous question and replace the Senate language with H.R. 7966.

This legislation builds on the STOP School Violence Act signed into law in 2018 by providing a billion dollars in grants to hire more school resource officers. It provides \$1 billion to hire mental health guidance counselors so that schools have the resources to intervene with these children in crisis.

Imagine, if we had been able to intervene with the shooter in Uvalde before he dropped out of high school.

This legislation includes \$5 billion to fund STOP School Violence programs to make schools safer, to provide active shooter training to law enforcement, and to better equip school officials and students and law enforcement to intervene before one of these students reaches the breaking point. This \$7 billion is paid for by redirecting unspent COVID-19 funds that have already been approved.

Also, under my legislation, schools can apply for a threat assessment to identify weaknesses in their security and to assess the mental health services at the school. We would also codify a clearinghouse at Homeland Security to collect and share best practices for school safety. These are practical, commonsense solutions that we should all be able to agree will have a real impact.

Madam Speaker, I agree with my friend. Now is our moment. Today, we can come together—Republicans and Democrats—and really address these issues in a meaningful way. We can do this while at the same time keeping the promise made by the sacrifice and the courage of our Founders by upholding our pledge on the first day in office to defend this Constitution.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the previous question so we can immediately consider this important legislation. God bless you.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Let me just say a couple of words in response to the gentleman from North Carolina.

He just said that Democrats and Republicans should come together. Well, they did. I mean, MITCH MCCONNELL is a Republican. LINDSEY GRAHAM is Republican. TONY GONZALEZ is a Republican. I mean, Republicans and Democrats have come together like they never have before on this issue. Maybe my Republican friends ought to get together with their Republican friends to try to work it out on their side. But Democrats and Republicans have come together.

I am having trouble following the gentleman's logic when he basically implies that if we can't do something to stop all shootings, then maybe it is not worth doing anything. Nobody is saying that what we are doing today will prevent every shooting. What we are saying today is that it will prevent some. What we are saying today is it will protect lives.

In the aftermath of Uvalde and Buffalo, people all across this country, regardless of their politics, were so horrified. They are demanding that we act. Again, as I said at the outset, I would have preferred that we do more. I understand that we can only get done what we can get done in the reality in which we are living here in the Congress; and in the Senate you need 10 Republicans to get permission to have a cup of coffee. The fact of the matter is, there is a process over there that has prevented even a debate on gun safety legislation because of the filibuster. But a number of Republican Senators came together because they listened to their constituents, and I think they finally said we have to do something.

No one is saying this will stop every shooting, but under that logic, why do we have fire departments?

We have fire departments but there are still fires.

Why do we have seatbelt laws?

There are seatbelt laws and there are still people that get killed in car crash fatalities.

I mean, the bottom line is, we have them because they save some lives, and it is worth it. As I said at the outset, for every item in this bipartisan package there has been a hearing on at some point. None of these ideas are new. So there has been a process.

But what I find particularly ironic is that as we are being lectured about, oh, we need more time, we need more hearings, the gentlewoman says that we should bring up the gentleman's bill and consider it immediately with no hearings, with no process. I mean, I get whiplash just trying to follow the logic of my friends from the other side.

Madam Speaker, the bottom line is either we are going to do something, or we are not. And those who are arguing for delaying this more and more and more are the same people who will never vote for it.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Madam Speaker, let me thank the chairman very much for yielding, and for the expeditious way in which the Committee on Rules realized that we are in crisis.

Let me just start by saying to stop the carnage and the bloodshed, I rise in support of the bipartisan Safer Communities Act. And since I know that this Congress has vision and it has passion to move, as well, the Protect Our Kids Act as we go forward in the future.

I realize that this bipartisan effort is historic, particularly in light of the Supreme Court decision which took history and literally shredded the constitutional privileges of life and liberty by suggesting that laws that under Heller were legal, could not be in place. Legislation that is going to come before us will, in fact, emphasize that we want to save lives.

Madam Speaker, I support this effort going forward because I want to say to the grieving families of Buffalo, the grieving families of Mother Emanuel, the grieving families in Uvalde, the parent who spoke to me just two nights ago whose daughter bled out, that we are listening.

I also rise today to support H. Res. 1132, which says to the world that the United States Congress calls on the Government of Russia, the Russian Federation, to immediately release Brittney Griner.

This bill was introduced by myself, Congressman STANTON and Congressman ALLRED, because we realize this young woman who grew up and was born in Houston, Texas, who, was a two-time Olympian, who is a renowned WNBA player, is now wrongfully detained in Russia. She has had a prolific collegiate career and went to Nimitz High School and Baylor University.

She is someone who has been known to be generous in her community by providing an outstanding program that helps young people. She has the Heart and Soul Shoe Drive. She is an American's American.

We ask that you support this H. Res. 1132 to release Brittney Griner now.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the rule which brings to the floor S. 2938, the Bipartisan Safer Communities Act, and H. Res. 1132, "Calling for the immediate release of Brittney Griner".

Both the bill and the resolution addressed by this rule advance bedrock American values and priorities that are intrinsic to our national character.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act provides reasonable, common-sense measures to enhance safety and reduce gun violence that is increasingly inflicting unspeakable pain and suffering on American families.

I have never met an American who does not want to keep their children safe, and especially protect them from gun violence. The bipartisan nature of the bill emphasizes the universal desire to protect our children and families.

When modest, reasonable measures can be taken to protect lives and avert tragedy, it is our responsibility to embrace that opportunity.

The Bipartisan Safer Communities Act will surely save lives. Even if it prevents just one mass shooting—or even if it only saves one life—its worth will be proven.

Consider what America would think if, without enactment of this bill, children were murdered in a mass shooting, and it were determined that the killer would have been prevented from their heinous acts if only this bill had become law. For those families in mourning, Congress's failure to act would be unforgivable.

Instead, by advancing this legislation, we will be averting the most painful tragedy that a family could experience, and many families will be spared that devastation.

The bill's reasonable steps will have a positive impact on public safety and family security for years to come.

H. Res. 1132, which is also addressed by this rule, calls for the release of Brittney Griner and, in so doing, puts Congress on record emphatically defending true American values such as our devotion to human rights, respect and dignity for each person, the right to due process, and justice based on truth.

Each of these have been offended by Russia unjustifiably holding Griner, and by the Russian distortion of a judicial system that extends her detention, preventing her release to return home, without a factual or legal basis for doing so.

Brittney Griner, who grew up in Houston, Texas, is an extension of all of us. She represents quintessential American stories and qualities. The injustices inflicted upon her by Putin and his acolytes in Russia could have been imposed on any Americans within their reach.

The denial of basic rights from Brittney offends all Americans because they are rights to which we believe all people are entitled. We do not accept the dehumanization that is commonplace in Russia, and our values compel us to seek justice for Brittney, her immediate release, and her return home to her family and friends.

As a mother who has raised a family, I can only imagine the gut-wrenching pain that her parents, family, and friends must be feeling right now. There is no worse feeling than when someone in your family is in imminent danger and they are beyond your reach to help them.

As a Black woman, I can say there's no greater fear than having a loved one being wrongfully placed in a situation or environment over which there is no control.

For any of us, if we had a loved one placed in this situation, we would be doing everything in our power to ensure their prompt and safe return.

We would be calling and seeking the help of everyone possible—including the media, the U.S. State Department, and even allies in Russia.

We would press every politician and public figure to fight against the corrupt government of Russia to ensure that our family member is

guaranteed their natural born rights to due process, a fair trial, and a prompt release from detention.

No American citizen should be detained in a foreign country for months, denied access to American consular officials, and dependent upon the performance of a Russian lawyer, especially in absence of substantial evidence of a crime.

Ms. Griner is suffering from Russia's heinous demonstration of power and control that stems from centuries of bigotry and hatred embodied in an autocratic leader who is the very antithesis of everything Ms. Griner represents.

Ms. Griner's detention is primarily based on the country of her citizenship, in a game of political leverage. Since she was targeted because of being an American, every American should take this personally. Her detention is an offense against our country, and against our people.

Griner was detained on February 17, 2022, her initial release date was set to be May 19th, it was then shifted to June 19th, and when that date approached, it was delayed to July 2nd.

That is not justice—it's oppression. We call on Putin and the Russian government to comply with their international treaty obligations.

By passing the rule bringing H. Res. 1132 before us, Congress insists, alongside the Griner family, that Brittney Griner must be immediately and safely released and returned home to the U.S. We are unified in demanding respectful treatment and justice for her, in accordance with American values.

I also rise in support of the rule by which the House has passed H. Res. 1132, "Calling for the immediate release of Brittney Griner".

A very important component of the rule currently before the House is that it: "Provides that House Resolution 1132 is hereby adopted."

I fought hard for passage of H. Res. 1132, introduced by Congressman STANTON, myself, and Congressman ALLRED, because, by raising our voices for Brittney Griner, we raise our voices for bedrock American values and priorities that are intrinsic to our national character.

H. Res. 1132 calls for the release of Brittney Griner and, in so doing, puts Congress on record emphatically defending true American values such as our devotion to human rights, respect and dignity for each person, the right to due process, and justice based on truth.

Each of these have been offended by Russia unjustifiably holding Griner, and by the Russian distortion of a judicial system that extends her detention, preventing her release to return home, without a factual or legal basis for doing so.

Brittney Griner, who grew up in Houston, Texas, is an extension of all of us. She represents quintessential American stories and qualities. The injustices inflicted upon her by Putin and his acolytes in Russia could have been imposed on any Americans within their reach.

The denial of basic rights from Brittney offends all Americans because they are rights to which we believe all people are entitled. We do not accept the dehumanization that is commonplace in Russia, and our values compel us to seek justice for Brittney, her immediate release, and her return home to her family and friends.

As a mother who has raised a family, I can only imagine the gut-wrenching pain that her

parents, family, and friends must be feeling right now. There is no worse feeling than when someone in your family is in imminent danger and they are beyond your reach to help them.

As a Black woman, I can say there's no greater fear than having a loved one being wrongfully placed in a situation or environment over which there is no control.

For any of us, if we had a loved one placed in this situation, we would be doing everything in our power to ensure their prompt and safe return.

We would be calling and seeking the help of everyone possible—including the media, the U.S. State Department, and even allies in Russia.

We would press every politician and public figure to fight against the corrupt government of Russia to ensure that our family member is guaranteed their natural born rights to due process, a fair trial, and a prompt release from detention.

No American citizen should be detained in a foreign country for months, denied access to American consular officials, and dependent upon the performance of a Russian lawyer, especially in absence of substantial evidence of a crime.

Ms. Griner is suffering from Russia's heinous demonstration of power and control that stems from centuries of bigotry and hatred embodied in an autocratic leader who is the very antithesis of everything Ms. Griner represents.

Ms. Griner's detention is primarily based on the country of her citizenship, in a game of political leverage. Since she was targeted because of being an American, every American should take this personally. Her detention is an offense against our country, and against our people.

Griner was detained on February 17, 2022, her initial release date was set to be May 19th, it was then shifted to June 19th, and when that date approached, it was delayed to July 2nd.

That is not justice—it's oppression. We call on Putin and the Russian government to comply with their international treaty obligations.

By passing the rule and adopting H. Res. 1132, the House insists, alongside the Griner family, that Brittney Griner must be immediately and safely released and returned home to the U.S.

We are unified in demanding respectful treatment and justice for her, in accordance with American values.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I wanted to point out to the gentleman from the Massachusetts that the majority solely holds the power to give the bill a hearing. And I am sure I can speak on behalf of the gentleman from North Carolina that he would be happy to be granted a hearing on his bill and would love to have that done given that you are in control of those hearings.

Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, it is a privilege to be here. This is a somber time. Yes, the Senate has sent us something over

again that we never got to really look into before we have to vote in the House.

Madam Speaker, I actually have a bill, H.R. 7909, that I think you all would be interested if I had gotten to speak to it in the Committee on Rules this morning.

It does three things: It says to our law enforcement retired professionals if they want to get a part-time job as an armed resource officer with the school district, they don't have to pay Social Security, withholding taxes, FICA—none of that—that is so they don't get thrown into a higher income tax bracket.

The second thing it does, is it allows schools to hire an absolute professional, a retired law enforcement professional at a reduced rate, because they don't have to match Social Security, withholding, and FICA.

But third and most importantly what it does, is it gives the students and the teachers and the staff of that facility, first-class armed protection in that school system and in that school district so that when and if this happens, they have got a professional there.

May 18, 2018. It was a Friday; 10 people were killed in Santa Fe High School, in my district.

John Barns, a police officer, an unarmed police officer was there within 3 minutes.

He came around to confront the gunman, and the gunman pretty much eviscerated his right arm with a shotgun. Other police officers showed up quickly.

Madam Speaker, we can do this with help to the school districts. We can get armed professional police officers there to help protect our schools, the kids, teachers, and the staff. It doesn't have to be about violating the Second Amendment. It doesn't have to be about taking away gun rights. This is one simple thing.

Madam Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to look at that bill, see if they are interested in it because it is one way we can help.

□ 1000

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I just want to take a moment to recognize and thank a longtime Rules staffer who will be leaving us next week for the Department of Commerce as their director of legislative affairs.

Rose Laughlin, who is next to me, has been with the Rules Committee for 8 years, starting as an intern with the late Congresswoman, Chair Louise Slaughter. Rose was Ms. Slaughter's right-hand woman.

Rose, I know that Louise was terribly proud of all of your accomplishments and your dedication to the people of this country.

Madam Speaker, I think it is fitting today that Rose is here because this will be her last rule on the House floor. It is fitting that she is here because this is a historic bipartisan measure on gun reform that will actually make it

to the President's desk. No one on this committee has worked harder or more thoughtfully over the years for gun reform than Rose.

Her dependable, resourceful, collaborative attitude has made this work easier for us all. This institution, and those we serve, are better off because of her dedication to public service.

Rose, you always will have a home here at the Capitol. We are going to miss you, but we are excited about continuing to work with you in your new role, and we are very proud of you.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, we join the chairman in wishing Rose the best in her future endeavors. Thank you for that.

Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, House Republicans want to ensure that our schools and communities are safe, but today the lack of hearings, the lack of public input, and the lack of procedure offends our duty to our constituents and our oath to defend the Constitution.

We are not willing to subvert constitutional rights of law-abiding Americans, like this bill would do. There are solutions to prevent tragedies like we have seen without affecting law-abiding gun owners. We can pass those today, and that, both sides can agree on.

Unfortunately, the legislation provided under the rule attaches these solutions to unconstitutional and misguided policies that are a "small step" in the Democrats' broader gun control agenda.

Madam Speaker, I oppose the rule, and I ask Members to do the same. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues, Democrats and Republicans, to vote for this bipartisan bill. It is not that long, and people have had it since Tuesday. It has been posted since Tuesday.

As I said, it is not everything that I think needs to be done. Certainly, it is not everything that we have passed in this House, but it is a start. If we pass this and send it to the President for his signature, and it becomes law, it will save lives. It is what the American people want.

Madam Speaker, I have talked to so many families who have lost loved ones to gun violence. I have watched the hearings in which grieving parents and brothers and sisters have talked about how horrific it was to lose a loved one to gun violence, begging us to do something so that no other family has to go through that.

For years, all of those pleas have fallen on deaf ears. When we have even tried to get anything done here, modest legislation, we send it over to the Senate and couldn't get the 60 votes to even have a discussion on the Senate floor. That just changed.

It changed, I think, because people are so horrified about what just recently happened, but also what has been happening time and time again in this country.

I know the question for everybody here is not about: Does this violate the Second Amendment, or is this taking away guns from lawful gun owners? It is not. That is all garbage. It really is. That is not what this is about.

I get it. The gun lobby is making phone calls and threatening to hold back checks if people somehow don't frustrate this bill so that it can't get to the President's desk.

We were elected to help people and to protect people. In the Senate, we have this remarkable bipartisan collaboration, and in the House, we have Republicans who have supported sensible gun safety legislation.

Madam Speaker, I hope this is an overwhelmingly bipartisan vote in the House. I know that it may not be because the leadership here has urged Republican Members to oppose this. I regret that very much.

When people say that this is somehow a leftwing bill—I mean, MITCH MCCONNELL, LINDSEY GRAHAM? Give me a break. This is a truly bipartisan bill. It is a compromise.

To suggest that we need more hearings on a bill on a compromise that every single topic in this compromise has had hearings on before, to suggest to do that by people who don't want this to move to begin with, come on.

This is the put-up-or-shut-up moment for people here. We either do something, or we are going to do nothing. We have been doing nothing for years.

I urged in my opening that people think long and hard before they vote. Consult your conscience.

I can't go back and talk to parents who lost loved ones to violence and say: "Oh, we tried, but it wasn't perfect." I could easily go back and say: "I wish it were bigger and more. It is not perfect, so I am not going to support it." I am supporting this because it is something, and it is going to save lives.

Madam Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to please support this. I urge a "yes" on the rule and a "yes" on the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. FISCHBACH is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 1204

Strike the first section after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 7966) to provide for increased authorization of funding to secure schools, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on

the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommend. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 7966.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time and move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 204, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 297]

YEAS—218

Adams	Doyle, Michael	Malinowski
Aguilar	F.	Maloney
Allred	Escobar	Carolyn B.
Auchincloss	Eshoo	Maloney, Sean
Axne	Espallat	Manning
Barragán	Evans	Matsui
Bass	Fletcher	McBath
Beatty	Foster	McCollum
Bera	Frankel, Lois	McEachin
Beyer	Gallego	McGovern
Bishop (GA)	Garamendi	McNerney
Blumenauer	Garcia (IL)	Meeks
Blunt Rochester	Garcia (TX)	Meng
Bonamici	Golden	Mfume
Bourdeaux	Gomez	Moore (WI)
Bowman	Gonzalez,	Morelle
Boyle, Brendan	Vicente	Moulton
F.	Gottheimer	Mrvan
Brown (MD)	Green, Al (TX)	Murphy (FL)
Brown (OH)	Grijalva	Nadler
Brownley	Harder (CA)	Napolitano
Bush	Hayes	Neal
Bustos	Higgins (NY)	Neguse
Butterfield	Himes	Newman
Carbajal	Horsford	Norcross
Cárdenas	Houlihan	O'Halleran
Carson	Hoyer	Ocasio-Cortez
Carter (LA)	Huffman	Omar
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Pallone
Case	Jacobs (CA)	Panetta
Casten	Jayapal	Pappas
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Pascrell
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Payne
Cherfilus-	Johnson (TX)	Perlmutter
McCormick	Jones	Peters
Chu	Kahele	Phillips
Cicilline	Kaptur	Pingree
Clark (MA)	Keating	Pocan
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Porter
Cleaver	Khanna	Pressley
Clyburn	Kildee	Quigley
Cohen	Kilmer	Raskin
Connolly	Kim (NJ)	Rice (NY)
Cooper	Kind	Ross
Correa	Kirkpatrick	Roybal-Allard
Costa	Krishnamoorthi	Ruiz
Courtney	Kuster	Ruppersberger
Craig	Lamb	Rush
Crist	Langevin	Ryan
Crow	Larsen (WA)	Sánchez
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Sarbanes
Davids (KS)	Lawrence	Scanlon
Davis, Danny K.	Lawson (FL)	Schakowsky
Dean	Lee (CA)	Schiff
DeFazio	Lee (NV)	Schneider
DeGette	Leger Fernandez	Schrader
DeLauro	Levin (CA)	Schrier
DelBene	Levin (MI)	Scott (VA)
Demings	Lieu	Scott, David
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Sewell
Deutch	Lowenthal	Sherman
Dingell	Luria	Sherrill
Doggett	Lynch	Sires

Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Armstrong
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozi
Swalwell
Takano

Aderholt
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Barr
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cawthorn
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donalds
Duncan
Dunn
Elizy
Emmer
Estes
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Fitzpatrick
Flores
Foa
Foa
Franklin, C.
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garbarino
Garcia (CA)

Allen
Conway
Kinzinger

Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey

NAYS—204

Gibbs
Gimenez
Gohmert
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez (OH)
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Gosar
Granger
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Greene (GA)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Harris
Harshbarger
Hartzler
Hern
Herrrell
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Hinson
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Issa
Jackson
Jacobs (NY)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lesko
Letlow
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Mace
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClain
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meijer
Meuser

NOT VOTING—7

□ 1058

Mr. CHABOT changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CLEAVER changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE
RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Gomez)	Frankel, Lois	Newman (Beyer)
Auchincloss	(Kuster)	Palazzo
(Beyer)	Garcia (IL)	(Fleischmann)
Babin (Weber	(Beyer)	Pascrell
(TX))	Gimenez (Waltz)	(Pallone)
Barr (McHenry)	Gohmert (Weber	Payne (Pallone)
Barragán	(TX))	Porter (Neguse)
(Correa)	Gosar (Weber	Pressley
Boebert (Bishop	(TX))	(Trahan)
(NC))	Gottheimer	Rice (SC)
Bonamici (Beyer)	(Neguse)	(Meijer)
Bourdeaux	Guest	Rogers (KY)
(Correa)	(Fleischmann)	(Reschenthaler)
Bowman (Chu)	Hartzler (Bacon)	Rush (Neguse)
Brown (OH)	Hayes (Neguse)	Salazar (Diaz-
(Stevens)	Hice (GA)	Balart)
Bush (Williams	(Bishop (NC))	Sires (Pallone)
(GA))	Jacobs (NY)	Spartz
Cárdenas	(Smucker)	(Harshbarger)
(Gomez)	Jayapal (Gomez)	Stansbury
Carter (LA)	Jeffries (Neguse)	(Stevens)
(Williams	Johnson (GA)	Strickland
(GA))	(Williams	(Neguse)
Carter (TX)	(GA))	Suozi (Neguse)
(Weber (TX))	Johnson (TX)	Takano (Chu)
Casten (Foster)	(Stevens)	Taylor (Nehls)
Cawthorn	Katko (Meijer)	Timmons
(Donalds)	Keating (Neguse)	(Wilson (SC))
Cherfilus-	Khanna (Ocasio-	Tlaib (Gomez)
McCormick	Cortez)	Underwood
(Williams	Kirkpatrick	(Neguse)
(GA))	(Pallone)	Van Drew
Cohen (Beyer)	Krishnamoorthi	(Reschenthaler)
Costa (Correa)	(Neguse)	Walorski (Baird)
Crist (Soto)	LaMalfa (Van	Wasserman
Davis, Danny K.	Duynne)	Schultz (Soto)
(Gomez)	Lawson (FL)	Watson Coleman
DeSaulnier	(Soto)	(Pallone)
(Beyer)	Manning (Bera)	Wilson (FL)
Doyle, Michael	McEachin	(Williams
F. (Pallone)	(Beyer)	(GA))
Espallat	Moore (WI)	Wittman (Carl)
(Correa)	(Beyer)	
Fletcher	Moulton	
(Pallone)	(Stevens)	

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3(s) of House Resolution 8, the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 217, nays 203, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 298]

YEAS—217

Adams	Casten	Dingell
Aguilar	Castor (FL)	Doggett
Allred	Castro (TX)	Doyle, Michael
Auchincloss	Cherfilus-	F.
Axne	McCormick	Escobar
Barragán	Chu	Eshoo
Bass	Clark (MA)	Espallat
Beatty	Clarke (NY)	Evans
Bera	Cleaver	Fletcher
Beyer	Clyburn	Foster
Bishop (GA)	Cohen	Frankel, Lois
Blumenauer	Connolly	Gallego
Blunt Rochester	Cooper	Garamendi
Bonamici	Correa	Garcia (IL)
Bourdeaux	Costa	Garcia (TX)
Bowman	Courtney	Golden
Boyle, Brendan	Craig	Gomez
F.	Crist	Gonzalez,
Brown (MD)	Crow	Vicente
Brown (OH)	Cuellar	Gottheimer
Brownley	Davids (KS)	Green, Al (TX)
Bush	Davis, Danny K.	Grijalva
Bustos	Dean	Harder (CA)
Butterfield	DeFazio	Hayes
Carbajal	DeGette	Higgins (NY)
Cárdenas	DeLauro	Himes
Carson	DelBene	Horsford
Carter (LA)	Demings	Houlihan
Cartwright	DeSaulnier	Hoyer
Case	Deutch	Huffman

Jackson Lee
Jacobs (CA)
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Jones
Kahele
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Leger Fernandez
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lieu
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern

NAYS—203

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bentz
Bergman
Bice (OK)
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brady
Brooks
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Calvert
Cammack
Carey
Carl
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Clyde
Cole
Comer
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes

McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moulton
Mrvan
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Newman
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascarell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ross
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider

Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Nadler
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozi
Swalwell
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Veasey
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Rodgers (WA)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rose
Rosendale
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Salazar
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sessions
Simpson

Cawthorn
Cicilline
Conway

Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons

NOT VOTING—9

Donalds
Kinzinger
Pence

Upton
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Wagner
Walberg
Walorski
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack

□ 1115

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MEMBERS RECORDED PURSUANT TO HOUSE

RESOLUTION 8, 117TH CONGRESS

Allred (Gomez)
Auchincloss
(Beyer)
Babin (Weber
(TX))
Barr (McHenry)
Barragán
(Correa)
Boebert (Bishop
(NC))
Bonamici (Beyer)
Bourdeaux
(Correa)
Bowman (Chu)
Brown (OH)
(Stevens)
Bush (Williams
(GA))
Cárdenas
(Gomez)
Carter (LA)
(Williams
(GA))
Carter (TX)
(Weber (TX))
Casten (Foster)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
(Williams
(GA))
Cohen (Beyer)
Costa (Correa)
Crist (Soto)
Davis, Danny K.
(Gomez)
DeSaulnier
(Beyer)
Doyle, Michael
F. (Pallone)
Espallat
(Correa)
Fletcher
(Pallone)

Frankel, Lois
(Kuster)
García (IL)
(Beyer)
Gimenez (Waltz)
Gohmert (Weber
(TX))
Gottheimer
(Neguse)
Guest
(Fleischmann)
Hartzler (Bacon)
Hayes (Neguse)
Hice (GA)
(Bishop (NC))
Jacobs (NY)
(Smucker)
Jayapal (Gomez)
Jeffries (Neguse)
Johnson (GA)
(Williams
(GA))
Johnson (TX)
(Stevens)
Katko (Meijer)
Keating (Neguse)
Khanna (Ocasio-
Cortez)
Kirkpatrick
(Pallone)
Krishnamoorthi
(Neguse)
LaMalfa (Van
Dwyne)
Lawson (FL)
(Soto)
Manning (Bera)
McEachin
(Beyer)
Moore (WI)
(Beyer)
Moulton
(Stevens)

Newman (Beyer)
Palazzo
(Fleischmann)
Pascarell
(Pallone)
Payne (Pallone)
Porter (Neguse)
Pressley
(Trahan)
Rice (SC)
(Meijer)
Rogers (KY)
(Reschenthaler)
Rush (Neguse)
Salazar (Diaz-
Balart)
Sires (Pallone)
Spartz
(Harshbarger)
Stansbury
(Stevens)
Strickland
(Neguse)
Suozi (Neguse)
Takano (Chu)
Taylor (Nehls)
Timmons
(Wilson (SC))
Tlaib (Gomez)
Underwood
(Neguse)
Van Drew
(Reschenthaler)
Walorski (Baird)
Wasserman
Schultz (Soto)
Watson Coleman
(Pallone)
Wilson (FL)
(Williams
(GA))
Wittman (Carl)

LEGISLATIVE BRANCH
APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2022

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the adoption of House Resolution 1204, the Senate amendment to H.R. 4346 is considered as agreed to with an amendment consisting of the text of the Rules Committee print 117–53.

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2022, and for other purposes, namely:

TITLE I

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

UNITED STATES MARSHALS SERVICE

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and Expenses”, \$10,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023, for expenses necessary to address threats to the Supreme Court of the United States.

TITLE II

THE JUDICIARY

SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For an additional amount for “Salaries and Expenses”, \$9,100,000, to remain available until September 30, 2023, for expenses necessary to address threats to the Supreme Court of the United States.

TITLE III

GENERAL PROVISIONS—THIS ACT

SEC. 301. Each amount appropriated or made available by this Act is in addition to amounts otherwise appropriated for the fiscal year involved.

SEC. 302. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

SEC. 303. Unless otherwise provided for by this Act, the additional amounts appropriated by this Act to appropriations accounts shall be available under the authorities and conditions applicable to such appropriations accounts for fiscal year 2022.

SEC. 304. Each amount provided by this Act is designated by Congress as being for an emergency requirement pursuant to section 4001(a)(1) and section 4001(b) of S. Con. Res. 14 (117th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2022.

This Act may be cited as the “Supreme Court Security Funding Act of 2022”.

The text of the House amendment to the Senate amendment is as follows:

In lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted by the Senate amendment, insert the following:

SECTION 1. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the cost of insulin, a lifesaving medication for the approximately 7,400,000 Americans who need it, is often prohibitive;

(2) in 2020, nearly 1 in 6 adults reported delaying, skipping, reducing the amount of, or otherwise not getting prescription drugs because of the costs of the drugs; and

(3) increased barriers to accessing necessary medication can lead to lower medication use and increase in cost of related hospitalizations and emergency room visits.

SEC. 2. ADDITION OF VACCINES AGAINST COVID-19 TO LIST OF TAXABLE VACCINES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Section 4132(a)(1) of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(Q) Any vaccine against COVID-19.”.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—

(1) SALES, ETC.—The amendment made by this section shall apply to sales and uses on or after the later of—

(A) the first day of the first month which begins more than 4 weeks after the date of the enactment of this Act, or

(B) the date on which the Secretary of Health and Human Services lists any vaccine against COVID-19 for purposes of compensation for any vaccine-related injury or death through the Vaccine Injury Compensation Trust Fund.

(2) DELIVERIES.—For purposes of paragraph (1) and section 4131 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, in the case of sales on or before the effective date described in such paragraph for which delivery is made after such